

Draft Downtown Plan comments submitted online

Name & Date	Comment
Georgina Valencia 10/21/2019	Housing in a downtown area (i.e. mixed use) will help to create a vital downtown. All of our communities projects that offer housing should have some percent of Affordable Housing included. Perhaps low/mod or middle income should be considered as opposed to eli/vli income to make any housing in the downtown area feel inclusive.
Georgina Valencia	Interesting concept and I have read and listened to the conversation on this type of zoning approach. Perhaps in a selected area like the downtown is a good place to start. I do think our Building Department is behind the times and a change like this could really pose a challenge for managers and productivity.
Ron Oertel 10/25/2019	<p>I'm not seeing what's "wrong" with downtown, as it currently exists. Nor is it clear exactly who/what is driving these proposed changes.</p> <p>There appears to be a concerted effort to change downtown (from a commercial "destination"), into a semi-residential neighborhood, with multi-story, semi-residential structures. The only thing that this will accomplish is to "replace" existing customers (who live throughout the city, and beyond) with customers who are fortunate enough to be able to afford the new residences. This seems like a colossal, but purposeful (and unjustified) mistake. (Again, going back to the lack of any understandable goal, in the first place.)</p> <p>As part of this effort (to diminish downtown's primary purpose of providing a commercial hub, for the city), the proposed diminishment of parking would (unfortunately) help achieve this undesirable goal. As would the insertion of semi-residential structures, reaching 5 stories in height.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the city has already approved a large amount of student housing over the past few years - apparently without any consideration of current and upcoming SACOG/RHNA requirements. I'm not sure if this now puts the city in a bind, regarding space to meet these requirements. If so, then allowing residences downtown to help meet those requirements is about the only justification I can (possibly) see, to change downtown into a semi-residential district. (Assuming that these new units also meet the appropriate RHNA Affordability categories.)</p> <p>Some claim that the city is experiencing a "shortage" of commercial space. In light of that, it seems particularly unwise to continue to compromise existing commercial sites, via the insertion of residences. In addition to the loss of future opportunities to expand commercial activities, there are some commercial uses which are not compatible with residences. One example is the compromise of downtown as an "entertainment" destination, if residences are housed above such businesses.</p>

	<p>There is also a somewhat different mix of city services (and costs), to serve residences (vs. businesses).</p> <p>And of course, the insertion of residences will virtually guarantee that parking will become much more challenging, for existing patrons of downtown. New residents will have vehicles, visitors with vehicles, and deliveries. In addition, new driveway cuts (to serve new residences) will decrease the amount of street parking, and will also impact pedestrians using sidewalks and cyclists using roadways.</p> <p>Up until this point, Davis has been unique among many valley towns in that it has protected its downtown, largely by discouraging peripheral commercial development. As a result, Davis' downtown appears to be both thriving, and relatively safe. Unfortunately, it appears that some are now attempting to irrevocably change Davis' unique/cherished downtown, for reasons that are not clear (or justified).</p> <p>I sincerely hope that the city reconsiders its plans.</p>
<p>Jordan Crumley 10/30/2019</p>	<p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>I am the owner of 212 University. I have reviewed the Downtown Davis Specific Plan, and I wanted to voice some concerns for the University Ave-Rice Lane corridor vision. Specifically on University Ave, there are a number of non-conforming properties and commercial multi-family properties that without suitable zoning approvals will be a major missed opportunity, in my humble opinion, to provide quality and affordable housing for Davis residents.</p> <p>Given the proximity to campus, the dearth of available apartments, and affordable housing it makes sense to me to allow existing commercial property owners to be able to provide some relief to these issues.</p> <p>I would love to be able to reinvest in my property and build more new units, but given the complicated zoning in-place I do not see how that is possible. I strongly hope that you will reconsider the plans for University Ave and allow higher density for existing multi-family units.</p> <p>I am not interested at all in disrupting the fabric of the street, but I think we can build in a way that a newer building would fit in well with the character of the street while providing residents with highly efficient and new construction units. And provide more units to the city to help reduce the cost burden that folks are facing. Simply put: with below 1% vacancy rates we need more supply.</p>

	<p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Jordan Crumley</p>
<p>Chris Williams 11/2/2019</p>	<p>Hello I'm a property owner on University Ave and I cannot for the life of me understand why the city would not include University Ave and the entire area between B street and UCD in this zoning update. This area is a hodge-podge of PD's and non conforming structures. Isn't the whole point of a revision zoning plan to bring consistency and uniformity to the areas being rezoned? On University Ave between 2nd and 3rd Street you have 4 small apartment buildings that are currently zoned single family. As property owners in this area we cannot even make the needed investments into our own property without attempting an onerous, lengthy and expensive zoning application which at the conclusion of there is no guarantee of acceptance. Leaving the University Ave area zoning unchanged is a missed opportunity and huge mistake. Please reconsider making this area neighborhood medium zone.</p>
<p>Elizabeth Haley 11/11/2019</p>	<p>I very rarely come downtown, there are so few businesses I'm interested in; they are all coffee houses, restaurants and not much else. RE Parking: Why doesn't the City I'd Davis purchase the vacant Ace Hardware building, demolish it and construct a municipal parking lot. Make all three lots city owned and charge a parking fee. It would bring in some revenue and eliminate parking meters. I'd pay to not have the hassle of searching for a spot.</p> <p>Also, downtown has become dirty, no business pride. Chamber of Commerce is useless.</p>
<p>Jeremy Howard 11/11/2019</p>	<p>It appears that there is so much focus on students and little to none on the changing demographics that see long time families forced out of the community.</p> <p>There are two additional factors that are creating greater issues.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Single family homes being used as dorm style living by students which has driven up rent and property values considerably.</li> <li>2) Tax policies which encourage passing homes onto family trusts to keep the low tax rate. Thus encouraging rental properties and lack of churn for family renters and potential home owners.</li> </ol>
<p>Frank Reyes 11/14/2019</p>	<p>Overall I approve of the concepts listed in the plan for downtown mobility. However, I would suggest consideration be given to remove access of certain streets to private automobiles and dedicating these areas to bicycles, pedestrians and/or transit. This is a similar scheme observed in "Superblocks" seen in Barcelona, Spain.</p> <p>The implementation of a city-wide shared cargo bike system, perhaps in conjunction with JUMP, can reduce the need for private vehicle parking spaces while promoting the public health of the population through an active lifestyle.</p>

Frank Reyes	I agree with the suggestion that mid-rise buildings, or higher, be allowed in the downtown area because denser housing can be supportive of local businesses. The removal of cumbersome regulations, such as parking minimums, can perhaps encourage the development of mixed-use buildings with cheaper up-front costs.
Robert Fung 12/4/2019	This is mainly a question about form based code not about the downtown plan specifically. I noticed that there is not a "single family zoning" in the downtown plan. That the smallest form was "neighborhood small". My question is in form based codes is it possible to have a "single family" form and has such a form been used in other cities when they adopted form-based codes. Thank you.
Georgina Valencia 12/13/2019	As I followed the DPAC process there was little reference, if any, to housing. In this final document there is a positive reference to housing. There is no question that the downtown will change. As commercial properties are purchased by outside commercial organizations there will be a need to go up and to increase density. As this happens, and I believe the change is positive, housing and more specifically affordable housing whether for sale or rental needs to be a part of the equation.
Georgina Valencia	We need a Chamber of Commerce or a Business Organization that actually designates what business is wanted in the downtown area. Then a plan needs to be created to attract those business's. Folsom did such a thing and ended up with Kikoman, Intel, Cal Iso and other business. Davis needs to do the same.
David Kane 12/13/2019	There's an error in the map entitled "Historic Resources in the University Avenue-Rice Lane Neighborhood" (Figure 5.31 on pg. 129).  The property designated #3 is the MacDonald House, the original structure on the farm.that was later subdivided to form the neighborhood. The map lists the address as 337 B Street, which was the case when the home was designated as a Merit Resource. Some years later the seven townhouses known as Central Park West were constructed on two lots in the middle of the block and the City asked the owners to surrender 337 and accept a new address. The house itself hasn't moved since it was built in 1894 but its current address is 397 B Street.
John Slater 12/18/2019	Hello, I'm writing to support much taller buildings in Davis. I work in Sproul Hall, which is 9 stories. We need more buildings in Davis this height. I think that the Rice Lane area, especially between 1st and 3rd should be developed with very tall buildings. I'm not worried about set backs. What I'm worried about is how long it takes me to get across town on a bike. Already, if I have to run an errand near the Mace Nugget and then have an appointment at the hospital, it's nearly too much to do on a bike. The footprint of town should be shrinking (perhaps via a land bank that would buy up properties at the extremities of town). We need to get a lot taller and more dense. Let's take the gloves off and really build a livable town that doesn't act as if it were a village. Let's grow up! I also don't care about parking. Parking is nearly always available within a few blocks of where I want to go. That means there's too much parking. Let's make parking expensive and rare. Davis is turning out to be just like any other town, full of ugly single-family houses spread all over the place. Let's do something different.
Katie Manzer	My family owns and operates PDQ Fingerprinting at 216 F St in downtown Davis. We have been in business for nearly 40 years and are a service provider for the residents of Davis. We own the building and have planed to develop the property. We are

1/11/2020	<p>excited to redevelop and improve our building which would enhance the downtown and keep our customers coming to us to help them pack and ship packages, complete notaries and fingerprints and pick up their mail from our mailbox rentals. The city did a survey and is considering designating our property as a merit resource which would inhibit our ability to develop our property. Our building does not fall into the description of a merit resource building as it is a cinder block building built in the mid 1900's. The building housed doctors offices, dentists offices and a chiropractors office before we took over with our shipping, notary and fingerprinting services. This building did not house a historic figure and is not a type of historic architecture and we believe it does not meet the specifications for a merit resource building. We would like the city not to consider our building a merit resource as this would limit our flexibility and our families future with our property we've worked hard to maintain and successfully own. We have positively contributed to the city and specifically our downtown and plan on continuing to do so in the future. We hope you factor this information into your consideration.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
Katie Manzer	<p>Being a downtown business owner and property owner, downtown parking is always a hot topic and issue. I also was on the DDBA for a few years and paid parking was always on our agenda and never was resolved on my watch and is still up for consideration. Because parking is so sparse downtown it doesn't make sense to me to loose any parking, it's just not practical. Even though our town is a huge biking city it does not mean everyone uses their bikes when coming downtown. This is unfortunate but can not be controlled. The downtown business owners have yet to decide if we should have paid parking for fear that it would detour customers from coming downtown to do business. Having even less parking would definitely make it harder to come downtown. It's already quite frustrating having to circle blocks to find parking, which causes congestion, wear and tear on our roads and often road rage. This is especially hard for our business that requires customers to use their cars because they are bringing boxes to our office to ship. I don't see how losing parking to provide walking spaces will help any business downtown. It may cater to some restaurants or bars but if it's not going to help all of the downtown then it's exclusive and would harm hard working business owners. I think we first need to solve our issue of paid parking or no paid parking before we decide to just get rid of parking.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
Landon Christensen 1/11/2020	<p>216 F St Davis CA 95616</p> <p>My family has owned and operated PDQ for nearly 40 years. Our building does not have historic architecture, therefore does not fall under the description of a merit resource. It's a cinder block building that's been a doctors office and chiropractors office, and now a shipping outlet. We hope the city does not consider our building a historic resource, as it will inhibit our ability to develop our property in the future.</p>
Landon Christensen	<p>As a downtown Davis business owner and member of DDBA, parking is an important issue. It would be a major inconvenience for our business (PDQ) and many others, if the downtown had no parking, and was bike/pedestrian only. Especially for our customers that often need to drop off or pick up heavy boxes. Even though Davis is a bike centric city, it doesn't make sense to</p>

	make it a bike only city.
Judith Recchio 1/11/2020	<p>Additional parking needs to be provided for the Amtrak station and to visit downtown. My husband and I frequently take the train to the Bay Area. These are sometimes overnight trips where we have suitcases or overnight bags. We have not always been able to find parking at the train station, and there is no other way to park overnight downtown or near the train station. Uber/Lyft is not always an option, has not been reliable and we should not have to incur this additional expense. Walking is not an option - it's 2 miles to our home, and that is not walkable with luggage. Nor is it reasonable in the rain, dark or bad weather.</p> <p>We need additional parking at or near the train station to encourage more citizens to use the train to go to the Bay Area. There should be an "overflow" lot available, or the ability to reserve parking spaces. We have been forced to drive at times because we can't park our car.</p> <p>Also related to parking is the traffic it creates in the downtown core. My husband and I were returning to town and decided to have dinner downtown on a Thursday night. The traffic downtown was awful, no parking was available, and after spending 20 minutes in traffic trying to get through downtown, we decided to leave downtown and eat elsewhere.</p> <p>Riding a bike into downtown is just not feasible for everyone (whether due to age or physical limitations and then adding weather as another factor), and Uber/Lyft is not a reliable or affordable option for frequent trips. I would like Davis to build or allow the building of a few parking structures on the downtown border to provide the necessary parking. Other options include using a system like Spot Hero, reservations for parking, or an on-demand public transportation system that operates 7 days a week for trips within Davis (like that being expanded in Sacramento).</p>
Gary Christensen 1/11/2020	<p>Our building at 216 F Street was recently added to a list of proposed merit resource properties. I'd like to explain why I disagree with this proposal.</p> <p>The building does not have any meaningful Historic relevance. It wasn't built in a particularly significant time in history and it wasn't occupied by a Historic person or business.</p> <p>It's not the most attractive building. The exterior is a very simple rectangular design made entirely of cinder blocks. I would go so far as to describe the building as "forgettable".</p> <p>In the past the City has recommended we make updates to the building to make it fit in better with the rest of the buildings on our block. We agree with the city and would like to update our building at some point in the future but if the building is designated as Historic it would make updating it much more difficult.</p> <p>While I appreciate the idea that our building is being considered to be a Merit resource I think it would benefit us and the City to</p>

	<p>not go forward with that plan.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p> <p>- Gary Christensen</p>
<p>Laura Christensen 1/12/2020</p>	<p>As the building owners of 216 F Street in downtown Davis, we were surprised to find that our building had been identified through a 2019 survey as a possible Merit Resource building. We were not notified of this survey, We only found out about it by reading the Downtown Davis Specific Plan. It would seem to us that the property owners should be notified when a possible zoning change is being made to their property.</p> <p>We bought the building at 216 F Street from the original owner's son, Malcolm Weaver. It was our understanding in speaking to Mrs. Weaver, that she and her husband built the building in the late 1940's - early 1950's as a medical building for a doctor and dentist. They attended the California State Fair where they saw a new building material, cinder block, and thought this would be a good material to use to build their new building. They also built their home on Russell Blvd from the same cinder block construction. In fact, when we would go to her house to pay the rent, it was like walking into our office building downtown - her home was a duplicate of our building. And we found out this past week, that the Davis Planning Commission approved tearing down her cinder block home on Russell Blvd. and building four condominiums in its place. If her home wasn't considered historical, why should our building be considered historical?</p> <p>Our downtown building is a rectangular cinder block building, set back 11 feet from the sidewalk. In the past, the city has wanted us to bring the building forward, so it matches the other buildings on the street. We would not be able to do this if it was considered a Merit Resource. We also don't feel the building has any of the criteria to make it a merit resource: no significant contribution to history of Davis, no significant person, no special architecture and no archaeological or anthropological importance.</p> <p>We would prefer that our property not be considered a Merit Resource. We would prefer the flexibility to develop our property as we see fit.</p> <p>Thank you for your time, Lynn &amp; Laura Christensen</p>
<p>Laura Christensen</p>	<p>As a business owner for the last 39 years in downtown Davis, I have seen many changes. The biggest change is the loss of retail stores. This is mostly due to internet shopping. The downtown has changed to be more of a restaurant downtown, with fewer shops.</p>

	<p>Another change is the homeless (drug addicts, etc.) problem. I have customers who will not come downtown anymore because of the pan handling, yelling, people sleeping on the sidewalks, etc. We have to monitor our property to keep trespassers from sleeping near our front doors. These trespassers will even move our outdoor lights to keep them from shining in their eyes as they try to sleep. My husband has to hose urine off the front and back of our building daily, because they use the building walls as a urinal. He also has to sweep up all the trash they leave behind.</p> <p>We frequently have to call the police to help with vagrants using our hose to shower, sitting on our property to smoke pot and other random acts. The police can't do much, other than try to move them on.</p> <p>It's frustrating as a business owner, because we have to waste time and energy dealing with the homeless situation. I even had a very scary experience this past summer, when I (a 64 year old woman) politely asked a group of homeless people sitting on the sidewalk out front to move to the bench down the street. They were yelling profanity, using our hose, smoking dope, etc. My customers were afraid to come into my business. So I bravely went out and asked them to move along, and they got in my face and said they had every right to be there and smoking pot was legal and I had no rights, they had all the rights. They were a really scary bunch of guys. I should have called the police. They finally moved on when I told them I was calling the police. This incident really scared me. Why should I have to be scared in my own business? I pay property taxes and sales tax and city business tax and DDBA assessment district tax, but I have no rights? This doesn't seem right.</p> <p>So I do appreciate the plan for a glorious downtown, but I do think the homeless situation needs to be addressed first. The drug addicts need to be helped with re-hab programs. If nothing is done, then the glorious downtown you have planned will be taken over by homeless squatters.</p>
<p>Laura Christensen</p>	<p>I am a business owner of PDQ on F Street in downtown. My husband and I started our business in 1981. We are celebrating 39 years in business this month. We have seen lots of change as we have gone to work each day for the past 39 years.</p> <p>What I am concerned about in the new downtown plan is the disappearance of parking. I can see that you are trying to get people out of their cars and on to their bikes. I have walked to work every day for the past 20 years. It's a nearly 3 mile walk and I do it for my exercise. But I couldn't do it without my husband's help. He takes my clothes to change into when I get to work and he gives me a ride home. People still need their cars, even if they are walking or biking.</p> <p>In our business especially (a retail shipping and mail receiving company), our customers need to be able to park close by to bring in their packages to ship out. We also receive packages for people and they need a car to take their packages home. This requires parking close by, so they don't have to carry heavy things very far.</p>

	<p>I'm concerned about the "shared streets". It seems we will lose all the parking on 3rd St. from A-H and all the parking on E St from 1st to 3rd. And F Street (our street) will only have parking on one side of the street. The E Street plaza looks as if all the parking will be gone from that location and some of the parking will be gone from the G street plaza,. Where will everyone park? We need more parking structures and we need to keep the on street parking. This is so important to a vibrant downtown. Our customers need to be able to drive downtown and easily find a place to park so they can visit businesses. Otherwise - they will take their shopping elsewhere.</p>
<p>Laura Christensen 1/12/2020</p>	<p>I was reading on Table 8H pg 241 about a new proposed regulation that no natural gas will be allowed for downtown - including restaurants. Electric only would be proposed. I have never seen a chef prepare food on an electric stove. It seems that gas stoves are the preferred method for a restaurant. How can the city regulate what a chef can use to cook his food on? This seems unreasonable.</p> <p>I would suggest less regulation and more freedom for businesses. Life would be easier for everyone.</p>
<p>Nicki Knutson 1/13/2020</p>	<p>As a 45+ year resident of Davis, I am not in favor of the proposed downtown plan. I do not think that a plan that favors pedestrians, bikes and mass transit over cars is a good idea. My understanding is that all downtown parking lots will be removed and replaced with 3-5 story housing and public gathering areas. I think this will result in fewer rather than more people coming downtown which will have a negative effect on downtown merchants. Reconstructing E Street and 3rd Street to shared streets will further discourage drivers from coming downtown. If paid parking is implemented, this will be a further incentive to shop and dine elsewhere. I also think that the plan favors young, mobile people at the expense of seniors and disabled people.</p> <p>If you want people from other cities to come to downtown Davis, where are they supposed to park their cars? Where are the residents of the new housing projects supposed to park their cars? Parking for the Wednesday night Farmer's Market is already a nightmare. These changes will make it impossible.</p> <p>I am also not in favor of adding bulbouts to several downtown intersections. In order for drivers to turn right, they must make a wide turn and partially enter the oncoming traffic lane. These bulbouts are also hard to see at night and are a danger to both drivers and bicyclists.</p> <p>I also do not think that the height and density of the 3-5 story buildings will create the small town ambiance which would make people want to come downtown.</p>

	<p>I am disappointed that there has not been more public notice about the proposed changes in the form of informational meetings, newspaper articles, facebook and nextdoor posts, citywide mailings, etc. I do not think most people are aware that the proposed changes are so drastic. It certainly surprised me when I looked at the draft. I am interested in knowing what the timeline will be for adoption of this plan after the January 14th deadline for public comment passes.</p> <p>I think that implementing this plan will be a big mistake and will have the opposite effect than the one that is intended.</p>
Robert Mustard 1/13/2020	<p>My wife and I own and reside at 549 I Street and have a huge concern about the Land Use Designation for the old Hibbert's site and the current Co-op site. If 4 or 5 stories is allowed, the privacy of our backyard, which includes a pool and spa, and our home will totally invaded. Please tell me this has been discussed in light of the Track-side Project controversy and some sort of mitigation was proposed for our 70 year old original Mustard Family Homestead. Part of the reason we love this location is the large backyard and privacy it affords.</p>
LESLIE CRENNA 1/13/2020	<p>ZERO WATER should be the goal:</p> <p>I highly support developing a district level graywater reuse system in downtown. I am concerned, however, that we might be missing an opportunity by not actually doing exploration and preparation for a district level system as part of this current planning process. How would this impact the "form" of the buildings? How can we best prepare for this?</p> <p>State level code for greywater system setbacks, clearances, and access might be referenced in infrastructure section (or Built Environment?) especially if new construction is to be expected to be greywater ready. Water fixtures and appliances should be located in proximity to largest exterior landscaping areas for residential units that are self-contained (not part of a reuse district) and barriers such as concrete walkways should include conduit for graywater system discharge lines.</p> <p>A district water reuse system would likely benefit from certain pre-existing drainage and plumbing configurations, for instance dual plumbing required for all new construction.</p>
LESLIE CRENNA	<p>INFRASTRUCTURE: In Chapter 7 p 174, Rainwater harvesting is not specifically mentioned as a possible alternate water source for indoor use. Rainwater cannot offset potable use efficiently using storage alone. (Page 177 suffers from vagueness; needs more headings/labels.)</p> <p>The Existing Water Demand number of 130 gpcd is the average for all of Davis across primarily residential neighborhoods. It appears you have calculated a number that relates more closely to the quantity of water that is used by the actual occupants downtown: 67 gpcd. Make the difference clear in bigger text. How was 67gpcd calculated?</p> <p>Water Reuse Scenarios</p>

	<p>Page 183: Business As Usual option should not be presented as an option. I understand the need to set a baseline but that should be presented in introductory text only.</p> <p>Sustainable Reuse and Resilient Reuse options do not include shower or lavatory graywater systems. This is a huge oversight</p> <p>In addition, the Resilient Reuse scenario should assert an indoor reuse element. This has also been completely omitted. The difference between the second and third scenarios is marginally different and should offer a clearer choice.</p> <p>The table on page 183 names "INTERIOR LAUNDRY" in the Recycled Water option column, but this is misleading considering the label in the Reuse Purpose option column is worded "EXTERIOR IRRIGATION." The descriptions on the previous page seem to indicate that the two are identical but they have different headings in the table.</p> <p>p. 186: The table should be improved. Present potable and non-potable demand first, then the total demand. Make sure to include the gpcd in the table as well.</p> <p>The water savings in acre feet due to Laundry to Landscape graywater systems appears to be rather minimal, I suppose because of the essentially non-residential nature of downtown. How was this number calculated? If both shower and laundry systems are used the number would be higher. More information here would be appreciated.</p> <p>How was 7 acre feet of water saved calculated as part of a district scale system to offset indoor non-potable demand? The column for scenario three does not actually subtract that 7 acres from the total. Seems to be a mistake.</p> <p>page 187: The circle charts are a bit confusing: Notes for Figures 7.7, 7.8, and 7.9: Scenario two says graywater produced will be used for irrigation, but the irrigation demand on page 187 circle charts indicates that irrigation DEMAND is now 0%. The offsets total 18% in the third scenario are being applied to Indoor-Non-Potable uses (only because the similar color wedges are applied just outside the Indoor-Non-Potable part of the ring) but not in the table on page 186. This is very confusing. Numbers don't add up and categories are unclear or mismatching.</p>
<p>LESLIE CRENNA</p>	<p>p. 242: Table 9H Action 5: Set Target Reduction Figures for Water Conservation and Graywater Reuse: 5A. Graywater plan: Integrated water collection and reuse through descending uses and support landscaped greenery (e.g. shade trees and interstitial habitat). Plan for graywater integration with landscaping, especially for multi-story buildings (look to San Francisco ordinances).</p>

	<p>Why isn't this already part of the plan and possibly in the form section (not sure)?</p> <p>5B. Consider requiring Net Zero Water in Downtown: capture and reuse all water, e.g., dishwashing systems, appliance and mechanical system recapture, stormwater, etc.</p> <p>5C. Embed graywater ordinance and requirements for all downtown buildings in zoning code.</p> <p>Why isn't this included in the scenarios?</p>
<p>Diane Swann 1/13/2020</p>	<p>There is a lot to like about this Downtown Plan, especially with its emphasis sustainability. I like the Plan's focus on increasing biking and walking. In general, I approve.</p> <p>I do have reservations about the raised two-way cycle path, particularly on F Street. I'm not sure why this is necessary and my first thought is that it is overkill on protection. The street doesn't feel unsafe to me, now. Because I ride an e-bike, I often pass other bicyclists. If I were to see bike traffic ahead that might get in my way, I would probably take the travel lane instead of the cycle track. With a raised cycle track I would be unable to move out of the way of vehicles. We have a lot of skilled bicyclists in town and the number of e-bike riders is growing, so this might apply to more than just me. Protected bike facilities can be too confining. There are also connectivity problems with cycle tracks. Going from Class II bike lanes to a Class IV cycle track on the same street requires crossing the street. I noticed in Sacramento on one of their streets with a cycle track, the only cyclist I saw was riding in one of the vehicle lanes, beside the cycle track, not in it. A bicyclist is accustomed to riding on the right side of the road and now all of a sudden for one short section, you're supposed to ride on the left side in a cycle track. Not everyone will do that. I'm not sure it's worth the money or even desirable. On H Street between 2nd and 3rd, a raised cycle track might make sense, considering all the perpendicular parking.</p>
<p>Gerrit Mulholland 1/14/2020</p>	<p>Although I agree that unifying the building codes for Davis is necessary I am concerned with its application to the Upper G Street area. Small Main Street as a category was not included in the consultants vision which may be a better application for this area of Old North Davis which is primarily residential. I am concerned about transitioning potential 4 story buildings in a block format against or across the street from 1-2 story cottages. The Small Main Street category allows for up to 3 story buildings not in a block format but rather in separate, residential style structures which is in keeping with the character of Old North Davis.</p>
<p>Gerrit Mulholland</p>	<p>Adding 100+ new residential units to the Upper G Street Area of Old North Davis which is primarily a residential area will impact parking. With 100 units comes about 150 more people with potentially 150 cars. Our N Street parking can not accommodate these cars. What is the plan to integrate the parking needs of these new units with the needs of the current residents and businesses? During the weekday there are no open spots in front of my home on 6th/F Street. Will these new residents be given N Street parking? Current residents need the N Street parking. I know I do especially during the day.</p>
<p>Gerrit</p>	<p>Keeping the feeling of Upper G Street as a walkable residential community should be the goal as we transition to a denser</p>

Mulholland	downtown. Not only is this area valued by the current residents it is valued by all Davis residents and is an asset that needs to be preserved. This can be accomplished by keeping historic building guidelines and the process of reviewing building changes in place, dedicate areas of open space with trees/shade, provide comfortable/safe walking sidewalks and intersections, keeping bars/late night establishments south of 5th Street and make it financially feasible for multiple generations (students, families, retired) to live.
Petrea Marchand 1/14/2020	In Section 1.2, I didn't see a discussion of how this plan will relate to the Davis Amtrak Access and Connections Study. It seems like the results of that study (draft due in January 2020) should be integrated into this Specific Plan.
Petrea Marchand	As a small business owner renting space in downtown Davis, I agree with the real estate analysis on page 19 that states downtown can absorb between 300,000 and 500,000 square feet o of new office space. If there is variety of small to medium office spaces available for rent, especially with improved downtown amenities, professional services will likely locate in downtown Davis and create more jobs. More jobs means more people will shop/work downtown. While this phenomenon is described in the plan, I did not see if appropriately reflected in the goals or guidelines
Petrea Marchand	I fully support the recommendations on page 169 to improve wayfinding and to provide suitable incentives for converting underused private parking into shared public parking. Specifically, I recommend that this plan call out the 4th & G parking lot and recommend that the City negotiate an agreement that allows employees with permits who work at downtown businesses to use the 4&G lot to park all day. The existing lot at the Holiday Cinema is often full when 4th and G is empty.
Petrea Marchand 1/14/2020	Goal 3 doesn't have anything about creating opportunities and choice for office space, although earlier in the Downtown Specific Plan is says that if there are workers downtown, they shop downtown. It seems like the desire to increase retail should be coupled with an increase in office space, since workers are more likely to eat and shop downtown. Deserves a separate "guiding policy," such as "Provide incentives to maximize choices for commercial spaces designed to attract innovation and knowledge sector jobs." When I was looking for small office spaces for my four-person company, there were few options – and there continues to be few options for people who want to locate or expand small professional services firms downtown.
Petrea Marchand	For Goal 5, add a "guiding policy" that the City should "Establish app-based guides for showcasing the public art and green infrastructure in Davis and encourage people to visit the City to experience these attractions." As an example, the City could connect City Hall, Central Park, the Bike Hall of Fame and the Aboretum with a "green infrastructure and art walk." The front of City Hall will include soon cutting-edge bioswales and new seating and drought-tolerant landscaping, which will connect nicely with the Central Park Gardens and onwards to the Aboretum as well as the Third Street Improvement Project between A & B. People can view the art in Central Park Gardens and the obelisk on Third Street. City Hall should also have some public art

	featured as part of the ground improvements. If the Bike Hall of Fame is renovated to include an outdoor café or other attraction for visitors, it will increase the visibility of this walk.
Petrea Marchand	Goal 6-should mention the need to create “green, pedestrian-friendly alleys” as a guiding policy.
Laura Christensen 1/14/2020	<p>I wanted to write about the proposed regulation requiring business owners to have only a certain percentage of their employees drive to work. Employers who aren't walking or biking to meet the proposed regulation requirement.</p> <p>Is this even legal?</p> <p>Business owners need less regulations and more freedom to run their businesses. We can't control where our employees live or how they get to work.</p> <p>Don't we still live in a free country?</p> <p>Less regulation - more freedom!</p>